

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of Applicant's foreign priority document. Additionally, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2 and 4. However, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims in the application stand in condition for allowance.

In regard to the objection set forth by the Examiner with respect to claim 5, Applicant has modified claim 5 in order to overcome these objections. Applicant submits that the issues with respect to claim 5 identified by the Examiner have been eliminated by the amendment of claim 5 set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner now withdraw the objections to claim 5.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 USC sections 102 and 103. Applicant submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention.

Applicant's presently claimed invention is directed to new and improved techniques for transferring image information in a solid-state imaging device. More specifically, Applicant has discovered that by varying the time period during which certain groups of transfer electrodes receive high-level driving pulses in the manner specified by the claims and described in the specification provides improved charge transfer for the imaging device.

Advantageously, Applicant's claimed technique provide systems that are capable of achieving higher driving speeds. The prior art of record set by the Examiner provides no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding Applicant's claimed innovation. In particular, Applicant notes that the Yonemoto reference, United States patent number 6,441,851 is merely directed to an imaging device having a driving arrangement that is actually opposite

to that which is claimed by Applicant in the present application and teaches away from the present invention.

More specifically, for example, the prior art reference cited by the Examiner is merely directed to an imaging device wherein when the number of groups of transfer electrodes receiving a high-level driving pulse becomes a minimum, the period during which the high levels are applied is shorter than that of other periods of time during charge transfer operations. In contrast, Applicant's claimed innovation requires that this period be longer.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the prior art set forth by the Examiner provides no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the presently claimed invention. In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner now withdraw these rejections and allow all claims in the application

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2003


(Reg. #37,607)
Robert J. Depke
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC
131 South Dearborn Street, 30th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 422-9050
Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail on August 25, 2003 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop Fee Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**


Attorney for Applicant

CHI1 #208920 v1